



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/895,954	06/29/2001	Lyle S. Corbin	150748.01	8107
22971	7590	06/04/2007		
MICROSOFT CORPORATION ONE MICROSOFT WAY REDMOND, WA 98052-6399			EXAMINER NGUYEN, DUSTIN	
			ART UNIT 2154	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 06/04/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com
ntovar@microsoft.com
a-rydore@microsoft.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/895,954	CORBIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dustin Nguyen	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,12-24,42,43 and 46-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,12-24,42,43 and 46-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1, 3-8, 12-24, 42, 43 and 46-64 are presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

2. In view of the Appeal Brief filed on 01/22/2007, PROSECUTION IS HEREBY REOPENED. A non-final Office Action rejection is set forth below.

To avoid abandonment of the application, appellant must exercise one of the following two options:

(1) file a reply under 37 CFR 1.111 (if this Office action is non-final) or a reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (if this Office action is final); or,

(2) initiate a new appeal by filing a notice of appeal under 37 CFR 41.31 followed by an appeal brief under 37 CFR 41.37. The previously paid notice of appeal fee and appeal brief fee can be applied to the new appeal. If, however, the appeal fees set forth in 37 CFR 41.20 have been increased since they were previously paid, then appellant must pay the difference between the increased fees and the amount previously paid.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: "execution by the a script". Appropriate correction is required. Applicants also remind to correct any other errors.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3-8, 12-24, 42, 43 and 46-64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brossman et al. [US Patent No 6,535,295], in view of Chinta et al. [US Patent No 6,879,995].

6. As per claim 1, Brossman discloses the invention as claimed including a method for accessing status information related to a process [i.e. status associated with presentation job] [Abstract; and col 2, lines 28-45] the method comprising:

receiving a request from a client for status information related to the process [100, Figure 1; col 2, lines 22-25 and lines 43-45; and col 4, lines 16-21];

identifying nodes in a network, each of the nodes executing a distributed thread of the process [i.e. spawn one or more threads to handle the presentation job] [520, Figure 5; Abstract; col 2, lines 31-36; and col 10, lines 51-56];

polling each identified node for status information associated with the thread executing by the node [i.e. status inquiries or processes poll for the status of presentation jobs] [Figure 8; and col 13, lines 7-12 and lines 16-18];

Art Unit: 2154

receiving the status information from each of the nodes [i.e. status is returned] [840, Figure 8; and col 13, lines 27-30];

storing the status information in a data structure [i.e. status database to store the job status information] [245, Figure 2; and col 8, lines 46-57]; and

enabling the client to access the status information [i.e. notify originating workstation] [690, Figure 6; col 2, lines 22-25; and col 11, lines 63-67].

Brossman does not specifically disclose

the status information generated by a script associated with the process.

Chinta discloses

the status information generated by a script associated with the process [i.e. scripting element] [col 1, lines 31-51; and col 22, lines 39-54].

It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Brossman and Chinta because the teaching of Chinta of scripting would provide a means for enabling programs or program components that are referenced via a URL to run on a separate computer from the web server and to persist between client invocations [Chinta, col 1, lines 47-51].

7. As per claim 3, Chinta discloses invoking one or more script engines to execute at least one script code that performs at least one action of the process [i.e. JSP engines] [col 22, lines 1-46]; handling multiple script threads during the execution of the process [i.e. multi-threading] [Figure 4; and col 10, lines 42-55].

8. As per claim 4, Chinta discloses wherein the one or more script engines are maintained by a process management system that executes on the nodes [i.e. application server] [Figure 3; and col 9, lines 42-67].

9. As per claim 5, Chinta discloses wherein the one or more nodes include a primary node [Figures 5 and 6; and col 12, lines 1-28].

10. As per claim 6, Brossman discloses making the data structure available to any node in the network capable of accessing a process management system in a primary node [col 8, lines 46-57].

11. As per claim 7, Brossman discloses wherein the step of polling is performed by the process management system residing on the primary node over an established connection with the identified nodes [Figure 8; and col 12, lines 60-col 13, lines 7].

12. As per claim 8, Brossman discloses wherein the identified nodes include the primary node [col 5, lines 46-col 6, lines 29].

13. As per claim 12, Brossman discloses wherein the step of storing is performed by a process management system executing on a primary node [col 8, lines 46-57].

Art Unit: 2154

14. As per claim 13, Brossman does not specifically disclose wherein the step of storing further includes: placing the status information relative to the executable process into a private data structure by the process management system on the primary node, wherein the private data structure is accessible to only script threads that are spawned during the execution of the process. Chinta discloses wherein the step of storing further includes: placing the status information relative to the executable process into a private data structure by the process management system on the primary node, wherein the private data structure is accessible to only script threads that are spawned during the execution of the process [i.e. access right] [col 2, lines 37-48]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Brossman and Chinta because the teaching of Chinta of access right would enable to provide application security services and components [Chinta, col 2, lines 34-36].

15. As per claim 14, Brossman discloses wherein the step of storing further includes: placing the status information relative to the executable process into a status value data structure that is accessible to any node capable of accessing the process management system executing on the primary node [i.e. storing temporary variables or other intermediate information during execution] [col 6, lines 11-16; and col 10, lines 6-11].

16. As per claim 15, Brossman discloses wherein the status value data structure comprises data for providing an indication of an event that occurs during the execution of the process [i.e.

Art Unit: 2154

graphical and/or textual indications of jobs and device status] [col 10, lines 18-21; and col 11, lines 19-28].

17. As per claim 16, Brossman discloses establishing a connection between a process management system executing on at least one of the nodes and another process management system residing on a primary node [col 3, lines 46-64; and col 4, lines 13-24]. Brossman does not specifically disclose wherein the connection is established by a script code in execution by the a script engine associated with the at least one node. Chinta discloses wherein the connection is established by a script code in execution by the a script engine associated with the at least one node [col 22, lines 1-22]. It would have been obvious to a person skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Brossman and Chinta because the teaching of Chinta of scripting would provide a means for enabling programs or program components that are referenced via a URL to run on a separate computer from the web server and to persist between client invocations [Chinta, col 1, lines 47-51].

18. As per claim 17, Brossman discloses establishing a connection between other client nodes and a process management system residing on a primary node, wherein the connection is established from a user interface executing on the other client nodes; and accessing the process management system from over the established connection by the user interface executing on the other client nodes [i.e. graphical user interface] [Figure 3; col 9, lines 9-13; and col 10, lines 15-21].

19. As per claim 18, Brossman discloses wherein the step of establishing includes accepting a command as input by the user interface to establish a connection with the process management system executing on the primary node [i.e. command option] [col 9, lines 9-13].

20. As per claim 19, Brossman discloses wherein the step of accessing includes accepting a command as input by the user interface to invoke the action of the executable process by the process management system from over the established connection [i.e. command selection] [col 10, lines 22-29].

21. As per claim 20, Brossman discloses wherein the step of accessing includes accepting a command as input by the user interface to poll the process management system for status information from over the established connection [i.e. user-specified job attribute] [col 9, lines 9-13].

22. As per claim 21, Chinta discloses wherein the user interface receives messages from the process management system over the established connection [Abstract; and col 5, lines 32-43].

23. As per claim 22, Chinta discloses wherein the messages contain information that is descriptive of the primary node [col 17, lines 2-12].

24. As per claim 23, Chinta discloses wherein the messages contain information that is

Art Unit: 2154

descriptive of a particular event that occurs during the execution of the process [i.e. determine the current status of the request] [col 17, lines 18-27].

25. As per claim 24, Chinta discloses wherein the messages contain a data structure that is generated as a result of the execution of the script code by the one or more script engines to indicate the status of the executable process [i.e. UDP status message] [col 17, lines 2-12].

26. As per claim 42, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1 and 3.

27. As per claim 43, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 17.

28. As per claim 46, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 18.

29. As per claim 47, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 19.

30. As per claim 48, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 20.

31. As per claims 49-52, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 21-24.

32. As per claim 53, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 19.

33. As per claim 54, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claim 5.

34. As per claim 55, Brossman discloses wherein the process management system receives requests to invoke the action of the executable process from the one or more nodes connected to the process management system [i.e. spawn one or more threads] [530, Figure 5; and col 10, lines 53-56].

35. As per claim 56, Brossman discloses wherein the process management system continuously polls the one or more nodes connected to the process management system to obtain status information related to the executable process [col 11, lines 17-27].

36. As per claims 57-60, they are rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 13-15.

37. As per claim 61, Brossman discloses wherein the process management system receives requests for status information relative to the executable process from the one or more nodes connected to the process management system [Figure 8; and col 12, lines 60-col 13, lines 7].

38. As per claim 62, wherein the process management system sends the public data structure to the one or more nodes in response to the request.

39. As per claim 63, Brossman discloses wherein the process management system sends the status value data structure to the one or more nodes in response to the request [840, Figure 8;

Art Unit: 2154

and col 13, lines 26-37].

40. As per claim 64, it is rejected for similar reasons as stated above in claims 1 and 3.

41. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire **3 (three) months and 0 (zero) days** from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in **ABANDONMENT** of the application (see 35 U.S.C 133, M.P.E.P 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dustin Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-3971. The examiner can normally be reached on flex.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached at (571) 272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NATHAN L. FLYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2154

Dustin Nguyen

Examiner

Art Unit 2154